DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 429 459 FL 025 811

AUTHOR Turner, Carolyn E.
TITLE Evaluation of an In-Service EFL Teacher Training Project across Costa Rica.
PUB DATE 1999-00-00
NOTE 42p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Course Evaluation; Educational Policy; *English (Second Language); Evaluation Methods; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Language Teachers; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Public Policy; Public Schools; Questionnaires; *Research Methodology; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS Costa Rica

ABSTRACT

Reports on the evaluation process and results of an in-service training program for English-as-a-Foreign-Language (EFL) teachers in Costa Rica. The program was developed in response to new public policy concerning EFL instruction. The project itself is described, but focus here is on the evaluation process, which was designed to examine participants' expectations, perceptions, and reflections on the program's success, and provide information useful in improving the program and informing stakeholders of its effectiveness. Subjects were nine participating instructors and 118 participating EFL teacher trainees from five regions of Costa Rica. Students were tested using an English language measure and writing samples and both instructors and students completed a course evaluation questionnaire. Course grades were also used is the assessment. General results indicate a high level of participant and instructor satisfaction. The method used to triangulate results is also recommended as a means for developing participant and regional profiles. The course evaluation questionnaire and study data summaries are appended. Contains 11 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Evaluation of an in-service EFL teacher training project across Costa Rica

ABSTRACT

In 1991, the Ministry of Education of Costa Rica (MEP) formally presented its new TEFL program for the public school system, based on a communicative approach to language teaching. EFL teachers across the country (the majority of whom had learned English as a foreign language but not studied methods of instruction) needed support through in-service training and material development. One major response to the above language policy was a collaborative effort entitled the COSTA RICA TEACHER TRAINING PROJECT (1989-1995). This paper describes and reports on the results of the evaluation procedure put into place for this project. Results are favorable, but more importantly, the evaluation generates data which are triangulated for an in-depth analysis of expectations, perceptions of achievements, local needs, and methodology and which have implications for language planning.

Carolyn E. Turner

ED 429 459

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Carolyn Turner

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Evaluation of an in-service EFL teacher training project across Costa Rica

INTRODUCTION

As a developing Central American country, Costa Rica is experiencing the increasing need for knowledge of the English language for use in its external contacts. Much information concerning engineering and technological development, the sciences, medicine and business management is available mainly in English. In the public school system, English is a required subject, but in general the teachers of English as a foreign language (EFL) have little or no formal training in the specific subject area. In the late 1980s, discussion had begun at the Ministry of Education of Costa Rica (MEP) to expand the teaching of English as a foreign language (TEFL) and to up-grade the skills of the EFL teachers.

In 1991, the Ministry of Education of Costa Rica (MEP) formally presented its new TEFL program for the public school system, based on a communicative approach to language teaching. EFL teachers across the country (the majority of whom had learned English as a foreign language but not studied methods of instruction) needed support through in-service training and material development. In theory, the program was to go into effect as soon as possible, but in reality it was known that a transition period would ensue. In fact, in anticipation of this new policy, preliminary discussions had already taken place on efficient ways to reach teachers across the country, especially those in the more remote and sparsely-populated areas. Before it had been officially presented, the impact of this new MEP policy was being felt. One major response was the development of the COSTA RICA TEACHER TRAINING PROJECT (1989-1995), a cooperative effort of the MEP, the Universidad de Costa Rica, the Universidad Nacional, McGill University (Montreal), and the Canadian International Development Agency.

After providing background information on the teacher training project and the general

context for program evaluation, this article will mainly focus on the evaluation procedure put into place for a specific phase of the project and the results and implications. It was deemed important that on-going assessment be conducted in the course of the project's development so that improvements might be made as the project unfolded. The true impact of the training in terms of teacher and student performance within the public school system will not be known for years. The decision was made, however, to obtain direct, short-term results concerning the perceptions and performance of the instructors and the participants within the current educational climate in Costa Rica.

PROJECT DEVELOPMENT BACKGROUND

The general objective of the teacher training project was to up-grade the skills of the EFL secondary teachers across Costa Rica through a collaborative effort. It was initially reported that of approximately 620 EFL teachers, 15% were high school graduates and 85% were either normal school or university graduates. Sixty percent of the latter group had taken EFL courses in their post-secondary studies, but had not taken any TEFL methodology courses. Those who had taken TEFL courses, were exposed to structural approaches to second language teaching (Smith & Turner, 1993).

The project was composed of several stages: Phase I (1989-91) material development; Phase II (1991-92) planning the selection and training of 20 instructors ("especialistas") among Costa Rica's EFL secondary teachers; Phase III (1993) training 300 EFL secondary teachers (participants) by the instructors; and Phase IV (1994), training the remaining 300 EFL secondary teachers. Due to internal ministerial changes, Phase IV could only be carried out starting in 1995.

Phase I (1989-91) consisted of developing 16 training Modules which were composed

of Videotapes and a Professional Handbook. The latter summarized the modules and provided enrichment material (including a list of reference books) for the teacher-participants. Reference books were purchased and placed in mini-libraries in regional resource centers. The Module topics were chosen in consultation with all collaborating parties. Twelve of the Modules were written in Canada at McGill University and four were written in Costa Rica to meet specific contextual needs (see Figure 1 for instructional Module titles).

------ Figure 1 about here-----

Phase II (1991-92) focused on the selecting and training of 20 instructors ("especialistas") among Costa Rica's EFL teachers. Due to the collaborative nature of the project, it was decided that the training of teachers should be done by local teachers. In order to achieve this goal, a multiplicative process was put into place. Once the Modules were completed, two professors (one from the University of Costa Rica and one from the National University) were given instruction on the use of the Modules. They in turn were given responsibility along with the English Consultant of the MEP to select and train the 20 especialistas. An eight-week training session then took place. At the same time, an instructional manual was written (Especialista Manual) and given to the especialistas to guide them in the next step of the project, that is, when they would go out and train the rest of the EFL teachers in Costa Rica.

Phases III and IV were set up for the large scale training of the EFL teachers (participants) by the especialistas (instructors). There were 600 participants, therefore the plan was to train 300 in Phase III and the remaining 300 in Phase IV. As mentioned above, Phase IV was delayed until 1995 due to internal ministerial changes.

The remainder of this article will focus on the evaluation procedure of the project put

into place for Phase III. It will be preceded by a short discussion on the general context of program evaluation.

THE CONTEXT OF PROGRAM EVALUATION

In the literature, one can find several descriptions of second or foreign language (L2) program evaluations (e.g., Clark, 1987; Davies, 1990; Lynch, 1996; Brown, 1995). These usually focus on L2 curriculum and L2 student performance. Less frequently, however, one finds descriptions of evaluations of in-service teacher training programs which focus specifically on teacher development and renewal (e.g., Breen et al., 1989; Pennington, 1989). This article addresses the latter type of evaluation, specifically a program developed in response to a language policy decision.

Despite the fact that models of such evaluations are lacking, one can gain much insight from the literature on program evaluation in general and on second/foreign language program evaluation in particular. Alderson (1992) stresses the point that there is no best way to conduct an evaluation. It is contingent on the purpose of the evaluation, the nature of the program, the participants involved, and of course the practical aspects, such as the time frame and resources available. Increasingly, one also finds in the literature an importance placed upon the notion of triangulation in methodology. In other words, data collection should be done using a variety of methods. The different sources complement each other and their combination helps interpret and confirm the information being sought (Walberg & Haertal, 1990).

Taking the above into consideration, the planning for the Costa Rica Teacher Training Project evaluation focused on direct, short-term results concerning the perceptions and performance of the instructors and participants. It was evident that the true impact of the

training on teacher performance, and in turn on student performance, in the public school system would not be known for several years. It was the belief of the evaluation consultant that short-term results could best be obtained through feedback from the people involved. Such information would help provide an early indication of project satisfaction, efficiency, and appropriateness in terms of the EFL teaching personnel. In the end, it was these people who felt the immediate impact of the language policy decision concerning nation-wide public school EFL instruction. It was the hope that this feedback would lead to further improvement of the program for use in Costa Rica and in other teacher training contexts.

METHODOLOGY

An evaluation plan was put into place for Phase III of the project (i.e., the training of the first cohort of 300 secondary teachers). This took place in 1993 over a period of four weeks divided into two 2-week sessions.

Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation was threefold: 1) to examine whether the needs of the participants were met (i.e., to examine their expectations, perceptions, and final reflections); 2) to use the results to enhance future training and to improve the instruments and procedures employed in the evaluation process; and 3) to inform all stakeholders in the project as to its immediate impact and to its general suitability within the educational context.

Subjects

Two groups from Phase III were asked to be involved in the evaluation: the instructors (the especialistas) and the participants (the EFL teachers undergoing training). From the 300 participants, a stratified sample by region was drawn. In total there were 118 participants and 9 instructors from 5 different regions: San José (Region 1), Liberia (Region 2), Turrialba

(Region 3), Limon (Region 4), and Heredia (Region 5).

Instruments

For data collection, a triangulation approach was used. It was anticipated that the combination of different measures (i.e., the combination of different perceptions and interpretations, in addition to participant performance) would best indicate program satisfaction, effectiveness and appropriateness at this stage. Four sources of data were collected: 1) the CELSA test (Combined English Language Skills Assessment), 2) a course evaluation Questionnaire focusing on training course content, 3) writing samples inquiring into pre-expectations and post-reflections, and 4) participant course marks.

The CELSA Test. The Combined English Language Skills Assessment is a standardized test which evaluates English proficiency for academic purposes. It can be used at the adult and high school levels. It was developed for the main purpose of placing adult ESL learners into different language ability levels. There are two parallel forms with information concerning ability levels for interpretation of results (seven levels from lower beginning to advanced plus). (For specific information, refer to Ilyin, 1992.) In this study, the CELSA was employed as an indicator of English language proficiency of the participants.

Course Evaluation Questionnaire. The Questionnaire focuses specifically on the training course content. It was developed to identify instructor and participant perceptions at the end of the course. It is composed of 22 questions (see Appendix A). Questions 1-16 address the individual Modules and employ a 5-point scale from 1 = very unsatisfactory to 5 = very satisfactory. Questions 17-20 address overall course evaluation employing 5-point scales assessing difficulty, relevance and appropriateness of evaluation procedures for participant performance. Questions 21-22 ask for suggestions concerning new topics to be

added and present Modules to be possibly deleted.

Written Paragraphs. The "Before the Course" and "After the Course" short paragraphs were developed in order to elicit a writing sample from each participant in response to a specific, though indirectly phrased question (see Appendix B and C). The "Before" and "After" questions respectively are: "What I hope to learn in this course" and "What I have learned in this course". The intent is not to correlate comments before and after the course, but mainly to provide for free communicative expression concerning course expectations and reflections.

Participant Course Marks. The in-service training project is set up as an intensive course of study for the participants. The evaluation format is clearly set out for the instructors in the Especialista Manual. Final marks are based on problem-solving activities (50%) and tests (50%) involving questions that reflect the objectives of each Module.

Procedure

In March 1993, the instructors were visited in their respective regions by the project director and evaluation consultant. The purpose of the instruments and their administration were explained. The instructors were asked to administer: (1) before the course, one form of the CELSA test and the "Before the Course" written paragraph, and (2) after the course, another form of the CELSA test, the "After the Course" written paragraph, and the Questionnaire. The instructors were also asked to take time to fill out the Questionnaire. In addition, they were asked to provide the participant course marks.

Data Analysis

As in all projects, one encounters constraints and/or unexpected events. As a result of a teachers' strike in Costa Rica, the time lapse between the beginning and end of the training

course was much longer than anticipated. This resulted in a modification of the data used. In the end, course marks were not used and the results of only the pre-CELSA test were used to help describe the proficiency level of participants as they went into the course. Results of the CELSA test were analyzed using SPSS-X providing basic descriptive statistics and analysis of variance (ANOVA) results to test for significant differences across regions. Participant scores were analyzed as one whole group across all regions as well as by each region - five separate groups. Results from the Questionnaire were analyzed using SPSS-X providing basic descriptive statistics and frequencies. Questionnaire responses from the instructors were analyzed as one group. Participant responses were analyzed by whole group and regional groups. The written paragraphs were examined using a qualitative analysis of text for factual content by category (Dey, 1993). Because the process is directly related to the product, further explanation is provided below when discussing the results from the written paragraphs.

PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

General results from the various instruments are encouraging in that they indicate above average to high satisfaction with the project across both the participants and the instructors. What is more revealing and helpful for project evaluation, however, is the triangulation of methods, that is, the information generated from combining the Questionnaire results with EFL proficiency levels (CELSA test) and with patterns found in expectations and final perceptions (the written paragraphs). Interpretation of data in this way provides a general participant profile as well as particular regional profiles. It helps explain varying degrees of satisfaction and helps identify contributing factors to project success (i.e., satisfaction). Results from each instrument will be presented below with discussion, integrating in a cumulative manner pertinent data from the other instruments.

The CELSA Test

The CELSA test results are presented in Table 1. Data from 105 participants were used in this analysis. Scores are reported in percentages. In addition, the CELSA adult ESL proficiency levels are reported. There are 7 levels ranging from "lower beginning" to "advanced plus". All groups fell into the two highest levels of CELSA, that is level 6="high advanced" and 7="advanced plus". A one-way ANOVA was carried out to check for significant differences across regions. None was found with $F = 1.93$ (4,100), $p < .01$. This fact should not stop one from analyzing trends, however. Patterns of ESL language proficiency across groups can be seen. Table 1 indicates a proficiency range from M=82.83, SD=14.05 (Region 2) to M=89.81, SD=6.37 (Region 5). One factor possibly contributing to Region 2's performance could be its geographical location. It is situated in the most remote and sparsely-populated area as compared to the other regions, thus its exposure to English is less. As will be seen, this data later contributes to the interpretation of results from the Course Evaluation Questionnaire and Written Paragraphs.

------- Table 1 about here --------

Course Evaluation Questionnaire

All Questionnaires were anonymous, but were identified by region. Both the instructors (n=9) and the participants (n=118) completed the questionnaire. Table 2 presents the raw mean ratings for all groups. All mean ratings indicate above average satisfaction for each question across all groups (i.e., above the rating of 3 on a 5-point scale, see Appendix A). More importantly, however, is the comparative degree of satisfaction. A general scanning of Table 2 demonstrates patterns within and between groups.

------ Table 2 about here ------

Questions 1 through 16 inquire into satisfaction concerning the content of the Modules. Considering the data as it was generated, the arbitrary mean rating of 4 was chosen as a relative boundary between satisfaction and less satisfaction with the intent of trying to identify patterns. It can be seen that the instructors were the least satisfied with Modules 9 and 10 ("Grammar Rediscovered" and "Stress, Intonation and the Individual Sounds" respectively, see Figure 1). The participants as a whole group were the least satisfied with Module 9, however, if one considers the mean ratings by region, it is Regions 1, 2 and 5 that have rated it the lowest among their responses. As for Module 10 and the participants, it is only Regions 2 and 5 that found it to be less satisfactory. All other Modules rated less satisfactory were isolated cases by region. Therefore, it appears that there is a pattern of less satisfaction with Modules 9 and 10. Table 2 also indicates information about Region 2 and Module content. It cannot be overlooked that Region 2 was less satisfied with six Modules. Overall, Region 2 rated all Modules lower as compared to other regions, with the exception of Modules 13, 14, and 15 which were three of the four Modules written in Costa Rica. As indicated by the CELSA test results, Region 2 had the lowest English proficiency. At this point one begins to speculate whether lower English proficiency might have contributed to less satisfaction, in that participants may have had more difficulty understanding and handling the material.

Moving on to the remaining questions, each one is unique and therefore will be discussed separately. Question 17 asked about satisfaction with the training course as a whole. The instructors mean rating was 4.78(SD=.44) and the regions ranged from 4.22(SD=.67) to 4.68(SD=.48).

Question 18 asked about the level of difficulty of the course using a 5-point scale from 1=very difficult to 5=very easy. It is the instructors (3.11, SD=.93) rather than the

participants (range from 3.15,SD=.87 to 3.8 SD=.36) who perceived the course as being more difficult. It should be noted that Region 2 did not respond with the lowest ratings, and therefore did not perceive the course to be more or less difficult than the other regions.

Question 19 pertained to relevancy of the training course content to the participants' personal classroom situations. On a 5-point scale from 1=very irrelevant to 5=very relevant, mean ratings ranged from 4.09(SD=1.07) to 4.70(SD=.68). The instructors perceived the relevancy as 4.56(SD=.53).

Question 20 dealt with the appropriateness of the marking system, that is, the instructors had to provide marks for the participants' performance. The 5-point scale was 1=very inappropriate to 5=very appropriate. The instructors gave the mean rating of 4.22(SD=.44) which was higher than all participant groups. By region the means ranged from 3.60,SD=.97 to 3.96,SD=.93. Comments revealed by the participants in the "After Paragraphs" provided insight into this difference.

Questions 21 and 22 were open-ended asking for suggestions about new topics to be added and present Modules to be deleted, respectively. For Question 21, 66 participants gave no response, 22 said everything was fine, and 30 gave suggestions. Besides isolated remarks, the two main themes in the comments were that another extended module on student evaluation was needed and that more content specific to Costa Rica and its curriculum was needed. In response to Question 22, 75 participants gave no response, 22 said everything was fine, and 21 gave suggestions. The majority of comments pertained to Modules 9 and 10, suggesting they either be deleted or else revised to correspond to the communicative approach. These remarks confirmed earlier data on Questions 9 and 10, discussed above, concerning Module satisfaction. It must be noted that one respondent suggested that all Modules (1-16) be

deleted. The interpretation of this comment is not clear.

Written Paragraphs

The "Before the Course" and "After the Course" paragraphs were written by a total of 92 participants across five regions of Costa Rica. The number of respondents for each region and the percentage of the total (bracketed), were as follows: Region 1, 35 (38%), Region 2, 16 (17.5%), Region 3, 8 (8%), Region 4, 12 (13%), Region 5, 21 (22.5%). The raw data were recorded by whole group and separately by region for the purposes of analysis within and across regions. Looking at the data as a whole, there were approximately three major learning expectations stated in the before paragraphs, per respondent, and three major perceptions of learning achievements in the after paragraphs, per respondent.

This section will be more in depth than the previous ones for two reasons: the results are (1) analyzed and presented in a qualitative manner, and (2) triangulated with the results from the previous two instruments thus providing discussion on profiles for the different groups. First, the actual intention and experience of using the instrument will be described; second, the creation of response categories will be explained; and third, the results will be presented and discussed in light of the instrument characteristics and methodology used.

The Instrument. The 'Before the Course' and 'After the Course' short paragraphs were in response to the questions: 'What I hope to learn in this course' and 'What I have learned in this course', respectively.

The open-ended question as one of the instruments in this project evaluation was chosen to elicit a writing sample from each participant in response to a specific, though indirectly phrased question. As distinct from the general format of the Course Evaluation Questionnaire which was based on a range of satisfaction from 1 to 5 and the CELSA language

test, this instrument provided for free, cursive, communicative expression which disclosed, as well as specific learning expectations and perceptions of achievements, written language proficiency levels and personal/professional needs which were, strictly speaking, extraneous to the question. This provided the evaluators with insight into the more holistic and comprehensive professional lives and language teaching experiences that the respondents were bringing to the course ('where they were coming from'). On the other hand, the paragraphs were restrictive, at least theoretically, in that they were framed by the indirect question and limited in length by the lined half-page provided (see appendices B and C).

Another notable non-restrictive aspect of the before and after texts was that there was no intention to intra-subjectively relate 'before the course' learning expectations to 'after the course' perceptions of learning achievements and there was little evidence of this. In other words, each respondent did not state his/her particular learning achievements in the light of his/her particular learning expectations. One of the factors which mitigated against this kind of correspondence was the four-week time lapse between the writing of before and after paragraphs. As well, respondents were not encouraged to correlate their comments by having their 'before the course' texts available to them while writing their 'after the course' texts. This evaluation instrument, therefore, was neither intended to, nor effective in, assessing individual learning satisfaction or dissatisfaction as might have been the case if prescribed lists of expected and perceived achieved learnings had been given for check-off. This is not, however, a detraction from the course as learning was perceived to have taken place as stated in the written comments of respondents e.g. "What I've learned in this course is not what I've expected when I came here for the first time. Let me say this: it's been more than I thought of!"

In many cases this instrument was perceived by the respondents as a vehicle for communicating more general observations of English as a Second Language teachers in Costa Rica both about the course and their day-to-day professional experiences contradistinct from comments in the purely and more narrowly cognitive domain (expected and perceived acquired knowledge). An example of this is the comment in the before text of one respondent: "I would like to be a better English teacher". This comment does not state a specific learning expectation, 'learning' understood as a cognitive item. Also remarks included criticism (notably in the after texts) about course logistics and organization, personal congratulations to the course trainers, gratitude for being invited to participate and being able to interact with professional colleagues, share experiences, and obtain information about teaching materials, aids, etc.

Analysis and Creation of Categories. The type of analysis adopted was qualitative analysis of text for factual content by category (Dey, I., 1993). It should be noted that, as the paragraphs were not intended as a test of improvement in written English proficiency as a result of taking the course, such written language components as vocabulary, grammar, syntax, punctuation, spelling, were not germane to the analysis. Because the written English proficiency level of almost all respondents was very high, clarity of meaning and therefore assignation to a category was a relatively easy task. In the exceptional case where meaning was unclear e.g. 'I know each step will give me selfishness in my job' a measure of interpretation was involved (selfishness = self-confidence). Overall, the writing was semantically clear and syntactically correct, the two outstanding lapses being the incorrect use of prepositions (e.g. problems on writing) and the inappropriate use of articles (e.g. to emphasize the oral communication).

The generation of the two category sets (before and after) was a derivative procedure, that is, the categories were not preconceived and examples sought out, rather they were culled directly from the raw data (databits) and recorded as phrases. This involved first a preliminary scanning of before and after texts and then a careful reading and manual notation of category and frequency within all paragraphs. This information was entered in the computer with a total count of 53 categories for the before texts and 68 categories for the after texts. (See Appendices D and E for category sets.) It is noteworthy that some of the 'after the course' categories evince spontaneous comments on the overall course experience and so do not strictly speaking answer the question: 'What I have learned in this course.'

Because no two people express themselves in precisely the same way, a measure of evaluator judgment was operative in category assignation. Some categories may appear to overlap, but due to the evaluators interpretation of the respondents expression and the reluctance to intervene, such categories were kept separate. The two category sets were detailed and specific with no collapsing or merging of categories into broader, more general ones. The category list reflected the literal comments of the respondents rather than second order labeling. For example, in the 'before the course' categories, the desire to learn more about 'reading skills, listening skills, and writing skills' were maintained as three discrete skills with particular frequencies rather than merged into the general, broader category of 'skills acquisition' with an aggregate count.

Results. Any frequency count of 15 (arbitrary) and over, across regions, in either the 'before' paragraph categories or the 'after' paragraph categories is considered a salient frequency cluster. Certain categories that emerged expressed gratitude, thanks and congratulations for the course. These were documented (See Appendices D and E), but

excluded from the discussion here in terms of expectations and perceptions of learning.

Results - 'before' paragraphs. Table 3 presents salient categories from the 'before' paragraphs in descending frequency order for the whole group, and the breakdown of the same categories within each region.

------ Table 3 about here ------

These results can be discussed in conjunction with the CELSA test results, if pertinent, in that they were both obtained before the course. Trends can be seen for the different groups. Looking at the whole group (n=92), it is evident that the enhancement of personal knowledge and teaching strategies as well as accuracy in English use were priority expectations of the participants. By looking at the regions, however, a specific profile emerges for each one in terms of focus of expectations. Sequencing of whole group salient categories varies within each region.

Region 1 (n=35) which is mainly the capital city area of Costa Rica placed an emphasis on wanting more knowledge in concepts and strategies (34.3% in Category 10 and 40% in Category 38) and, as compared to other regions, felt ready to prepare and seek out teaching materials (31.4% in Category 18). Less emphasis was placed on improving personal English proficiency. This region ranked fourth in CELSA test results.

In Region 2 (n=16), which ranked fifth (the least proficient) on the CELSA test and is also the most isolated region, 43.8% expressed the desire to improve accuracy in English use in Category 4 and 25% to improve colloquial English fluency in Category 32. Learning about new concepts was hoped for by 50% (Category 10). Also 31.3% wanted to learn more about ESL pedagogy through collegial exchange (Category 15).

In Region 3 (n=8), which ranked third on the CELSA test, 50% expressed the desire

to improve their English accuracy (Category 4). An emphasis by 37.5% was placed on hoping to learn new strategies, but no interest was expressed in new teaching techniques using technology. Also no interest was expressed in learning how to prepare or obtain new teaching materials.

In Region 4 (n=12), which ranked second or approximately the same as Region 5 on the CELSA test, 33.3% placed an emphasis on wanting to improve English accuracy. The major focus in this group was in wanting to learn new teaching techniques using technology (50%, Category 5). As in Region 3, no interest was expressed in learning how to prepare or obtain new teaching materials.

Region 5 (n=21), which ranked first on the CELSA test, was the only region which placed a higher priority for learning expectations on improving colloquial English fluency (28.6%, Category 32) as opposed to improving English accuracy (19%, Category 4). The two main areas of expectations for this region were learning about ESL pedagogy through collegial exchange (47.6%, Category 15) and learning new teaching techniques using technology (52.4%, Category 5).

Results - 'after' paragraphs. Table 4 presents salient categories from the 'after' paragraphs in descending frequency order for the whole group, and the breakdown of the same categories within each region.

------ Table 4 about here ------

These results (i.e., perceptions of achievements) can be discussed in conjunction with the CELSA test, Course evaluation questionnaire, and 'before' paragraph results. Again trends can be seen for the different groups, but what is interesting is that three of the salient categories (23,16,30) that emerged in the 'after' paragraphs are strikingly similar in topic to

four of the categories that emerged in the 'before' paragraphs (Categories 10, 4 and 32, 15 respectively). As was explained in the section above (Written Paragraphs: The Instrument), the two written paragraphs were not intentionally constructed to generate corresponding categories.

Looking at the whole group (n=92), it is evident that perceptions of course achievements focus on the philosophy and implementation of the communicative approach (63%, Category 12). In addition, gains in personal knowledge concerning 'refresher' ideas as well as in English proficiency are noteworthy. A portion of the former appears to have come about through collegial exchange (20.7%, Category 30), which was a salient category in the 'before' paragraphs (25%, Category 15). This seems to indicate that this need or expressed desire was addressed. By looking at the regions, a specific profile emerges for each one in terms of focus of perceived achievements. Sequencing of whole group salient categories varies within each region, with the exception that Category 12 is the main focus for all groups in terms of perceived learning.

Besides the top Category 12, Region 1 perceived that learning mainly focused on new ideas (45.7%, Category 23) and student-centered strategies (34.3%, Category 14). Category 23 was a priority expectation (in the 'before' paragraphs, Category 10) for this group and the results demonstrate that the participants perceive it as a salient area of learning as well.

In the Course Evaluation Questionnaire, Region 2 expressed having difficulty with more Modules, comparatively speaking, that the other Regions. CELSA test scores also indicate lower English proficiency. Combining this data, it is noteworthy that perceptions of learning achievements in the communicative approach, new ideas and student-centered strategies are indicated by this region, but in less elevated percentages as in the other regions

(with the exception of a similar % with Region 3 in Category 23). Perceptions of achievement in English (Category 16) were expressed by 25%. Also learning through collegial exchange was emphasized by 25%, which is the same percentage that expressed a desire to do so in the 'before' paragraphs.

Region 3 indicates the most elevated perception of learning as compared to other regions in the area of the communicative approach (75%, Category 12). The perceptions of achievements appear balanced (25%) across the other salient areas with the exception of 12.5% in gaining information through collegial exchange (Category 30). It is interesting, however, that the same percentage of 12.5% had also expressed a desire to learn through collegial exchange in the 'before' paragraphs.

Besides the top category, the perceptions of learning in Region 4 focused on new ideas (Category 23) and student-centered strategies (Category 14). The lowest percentage as compared to other regions was documented in English improvement (8.3%, Category 16). This region had ranked second or approximately the same as Region 5 on the CELSA test. No mention was made of learning through collegial exchange (Category 30).

Besides the top category, responses were notably high in Region 5 in Categories 16 and 30 as compared to other regions (these perceptions of learning being 52.4% in English and 42.9% through collegial exchange). It is noteworthy that this region scored the highest on the CELSA test (very similar to Region 4, however) and along with Region 1 found the course more difficult than the other regions (when looking at raw means in the Course Evaluation Questionnaire). Expectations for learning through collegial exchange had been 47.6% in the 'before' paragraphs, and perceptions of such learning were 42.9%. It appears this need had been addressed.

SUMMARY OF COMBINED RESULTS AND SUGGESTIONS

In terms of data for evaluation purposes, the combined results have brought to light several patterns. In general, the feedback is most encouraging in that it indicates high satisfaction with this teacher training course. In addition, specific categories of perceived learning by the participants are identified. When analyzed closely, ideas and needs for further professional development for the EFL teachers beyond this course can be inferred. Also ideas for methodology modification can be examined for such future projects.

To summarize this project evaluation, first, a general qualitative overview of the feedback from participants is provided, and second, specific suggestions drawn from the data are enumerated.

Apart from gratitude for being invited to participate in the course and thanks to the course trainers which were expressed in both before and after texts, the evaluative or critical comments were noted of necessity in the 'after' paragraphs. The observations which follow are based on comments made irrespective of frequency, but which follow the general salient categories. In addition, certain isolated criticisms were documented and are presented even though some comments only have a frequency of 1. It was evident from many texts that the course was a much needed and long awaited refresher for teachers who had graduated from university many years earlier or who had at any rate never pursued post-graduate courses in the field of L2 teaching. Although the course was intensive, with a lot of new information given in little time, and induced stress in some cases, the final outcome in learning objectives and satisfaction was positive and appreciated. ("As a conclusion, I'll say that this was the best training course I've taken since I graduated from university.")

The Professional Handbook was commended in several instances for its thoroughgoing

analytical ("scientific"; "good review of theory") and comprehensive coverage of the communicative approach to second language teaching ("learned how to break down the language in order to teach it more effectively"). It was cited for teaching **what to do** as well as **what not to do** in the classroom and its comprehensiveness can be inferred from the comment "it's like a teacher's Bible". Also there were expressed intentions to use this book as an ongoing resource to aid in lesson planning.

One of the major impacts of the Videotapes was that they **demonstrated** a different teacher role ("new way of teaching"), that is, from traditional instructor and corrector to facilitator and resource person. Effectively teachers saw how to change from instant, interruptive correction of grammatical imperfections in speech to listening for an "understandable message" thereby encouraging fluent speech ("most important thing in teaching a language is communication"). The point was conveyed that self-correction will take place during the learning process through student interaction and timely teacher modeling (for example, before and after an activity). This removes the disincentive created by constant, interruptive and irritating correction and impacts positively on student attitude.

For a number of participants the 4-week course was a unique opportunity to speak English almost constantly ("practice the language") which put them in a different linguistic mind-set preparatory to returning to their classrooms and resolutely teaching English in English. The teaching/learning ambience established by the course trainers was both intensive and at a high level of proficiency. Notwithstanding this observation, some remarked that the course was a "combination of teaching cultures". Perhaps implied in this comment is that the trainers were the bridge between traditional methodology and practice and the newer communicative approach. The course "used many techniques that are according to our real

situation."

Several participants expressed their pleasure that the course was given locally rather than in the central capital only.

Some of the negative but isolated criticism of the course centered on such issues as lack of time to assimilate factual content ("more time for reading and studying", and implement some activities, superfluousness and impracticality of written exams ("tests not necessary for professionals"), the need for more presentations on each module and their evaluation by the participants, unsuitability of some modules for secondary school teachers ("some modules suited only for higher levels") the unrealism or inappropriateness of some videos in the elevated spoken English level of some students which led one respondent to suggest that more videos should have been filmed in Costa Rica classrooms. Perhaps this last concern is related to an apprehension, as expressed by one participant, that "results will not be as good in Costa Rican schools as depicted in videos". At the very least it is a comment about the need for comparability in educational context. One respondent remarked that there was "not enough emphasis on how to get over student rejection of being taught English in English". Another participant suggested that time should have been provided for developing the answers, in a group, to Questions at the end of each Module.

To summarize, the open-ended nature of the paragraph responses generated much rich data. It can be inferred from the comments and vocabulary used that the teacher participants now had more knowledge of and experience with the communicative approach and wanted to learn more about methodology and associated technology, materials, and teaching aids.

Combining and examining the results from all the instruments has generated the following suggestions for future directions:

1. That the content of Module 9 (Grammar Rediscovered) and Module 10 (Stress, Intonation and the Individual Sounds) be carefully scrutinized for pertinence and revision.

2. That the possible inclusion of a module on the subject of instructional techniques using technology be considered.

3. That more country-specific material and examples be integrated into the Modules, where possible, or that one specific module reflect the country's curriculum and classroom context.

4. That the marking system for the course participants be revised, and possibly providing more support for the instructors in constructing appropriate assessment procedures.

5. That the intense nature of the course be looked at closely and possibly modified for future occasions. It is true that practical constraints must be considered, but content overload on participants is a factor in long-term course effectiveness.

6. That English language instruction be provided for participants in regions where lower proficiency may have contributed to less satisfaction in the course with consequent less effectiveness in the classroom.

7. That all efforts be made to use the instruments as intended to ensure complete data explanation. (Explanation: As mentioned in the 'analysis of data' section, due to local constraints and a teacher strike, the 'after the course' CELSA test results were not used due to the unpredicted lapse of time away from the course. Also participant course marks were not documented as anticipated.)

8. That the methodology used in the paragraph content analysis now be expanded. (Explanation: As stated earlier, analysis would have had greater scientific validity if category lists had been drawn up beforehand and the same list given to participants before and after taking the course. Alternatively, if the respondents' before paragraph had been returned at the

time of writing the after paragraph, one can surmise that there would have been greater relatedness and correspondence between expected and achieved learning. Now that the category lists have been evolved, for future similar projects, the pre-set learning lists could be instated in addition to the paragraph writing sample, however, the paragraph would be for general comments, overall impressions of the course, personal experiences and affective comments such as congratulations or thanks to the course trainers.)

CONCLUSION

In looking back at the 3-fold purpose of the evaluation procedure, we can say that all objectives were met: 1) Data pertaining to short-term results enabled us to examine participant expectations, satisfaction, perceptions, and also to see how these factors may or may not have been affected by English proficiency level, local considerations, etc.; 2) The data generated in addition to the experience with the methodology enabled us to assess the instruments and procedure; and 3) The information was sufficient to inform all stakeholders about the initial impact of the project as well as its suitability.

As is always the case, however, one must be cautious in interpreting such data. Due to the nature of the analysis, only patterns and trends can actually be inferred. In addition, when individual groups are considered (in this case the regions), n's can be small. In the specific instance of this teacher-training course, however, the triangulation of data has contributed insight into the project evaluation that any one single instrument could not have done. It has allowed certain patterns to emerge that merit further exploration for validation purposes. It has revealed both strengths and weaknesses in implementing such a project throughout a whole country. A general profile for the whole group of participants emerged, but as separate regions were examined, a unique profile for each one became evident. This brought to our

attention the need to address such teacher training at both the country-wide and local levels. These factors alone have implications for future program implementation and research in similar settings.

This project, furthermore, was in response to a language policy decision concerning nation-wide public school EFL instruction. Often in these circumstances, time is of the essence. The short-term evaluation of this project provided positive feedback (and areas of needed revisions in instruments, methodology, etc.) and, at the same time, revealed the perceptions of the EFL teaching personnel who felt the immediate impact of such a decision. This also has implications for language planning.

To date, there are other countries which are experiencing the consequences of similar language policy decisions as Costa Rica. They have expressed interest in the COSTA RICA TEACHER TRAINING PROJECT. In addition, Costa Rica is presently extending its EFL instruction to the elementary level. The information generated from the project evaluation reported here will prove beneficial in dealing with these contexts.

REFERENCES

Alderson, J.C. (1992). Guidelines for the evaluation of second language education. In J.C. Alderson & A. Beretta (Eds.), Evaluating second language education (pp. 274-304). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Breen, M, Candlin, C., Dam, L. & Gabrielsen, G. (1989). The evolution of a teacher training programme. In R.K. Johnson (Ed.), The second language curriculum (pp. 111-135). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, J.D. (1995). The elements of language curriculum: a systematic approach to program development. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Clark, J.L. (1987). Curriculum renewal in school foreign language learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Davies, A. (1990). Principles of language testing. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Dey, I. (1993). Qualitative data analysis. London: Routledge.

Ilyin, D. (1992). CELSA User's Guide. San Francisco, CA: Association of Classroom Teacher Testers.

Lynch, B. (1996). Language program evaluation: Theory and practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pennington, M.C. (1989). Faculty development for language programs. In R.K. Johnson (Ed.), The second language curriculum (pp. 91-110). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, D. & Turner, C.E. (1993). The development of EFL teacher training in Costa Rica: Narrative report. CIDA.

Walberg, H.J. & Haertel, G.D. (Eds.). (1990). The international encyclopedia of educational evaluation. Oxford: Pergamon.

Figure 1

Modules Titles

1. Teaching English in English
2. Steps to Creative Speaking
3. Listening Comprehension
4. Reading Tasks
5. Writing: Focus on the Product
6. Writing: The Creative Process
7. Group Interaction Strategies
8. Books and Boards
9. Grammar Rediscovered
10. Stress, Intonation and the Individual Sounds
11. Practical Evaluation
12. Teaching English in a World at Peace
13. Developing a Lesson Plan
14. Reading Evaluation
15. Inexpensive, Free and Teacher-Made Materials
16. Curriculum Design

Table 1

CELSA Test Results: Participant Scores

GROUP	n	M (SD)	CELSA LEVEL (1-7)
Whole Group	105	85.93 (9.98)	6
R1	52	84.17 (10.11)	6
R2	12	82.83 (14.05)	6
R3	10	87.00 (9.96)	6
R4	10	89.60 (7.59)	7
R5	21	89.91 (6.37)	7

Note: R=region, M=mean, SD=standard deviation

THE COSTA RICA TEACHER TRAINING PROJECT
COURSE EVALUATION

Your opinion of this project would be greatly valued. It would be most helpful, therefore, if you would complete this evaluation form.

Please examine the following scale:

Very unsatisfactory				Very satisfactory
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

(Note that **1** indicates a very unsatisfactory evaluation and **5** indicates a very satisfactory evaluation; **2**, **3** and **4** indicate in-between evaluations. You will be asked to circle the number that you consider appropriate.)

QUESTIONS 1-16. EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL MODULES.

INDICATE YOUR EVALUATION OF EACH MODULE BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER.

1. Module 1. Circle the appropriate number.

Teaching English in English	Very unsatisfactory				Very satisfactory
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

2. Module 2. Circle the appropriate number.

Steps to Creative Speaking	Very unsatisfactory				Very satisfactory
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

3. Module 3. Circle the appropriate number.

Listening Compre-hension	Very unsatisfactory				Very satisfactory
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

4. Module 4. Circle the appropriate number.

Reading Tasks	Very unsatisfactory				Very satisfactory
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

12. Module 12. Circle the appropriate number.

	Very unsatisfactory				Very satisfactory
Teaching English in a World at Peace	1	2	3	4	5

13. Module 13. Circle the appropriate number.

	Very unsatisfactory				Very satisfactory
Developing a Lesson Plan	1	2	3	4	5

14. Module 14. Circle the appropriate number.

	Very unsatisfactory				Very satisfactory
Reading Strategies	1	2	3	4	5

15. Module 15. Circle the appropriate number.

	Very unsatisfactory				Very satisfactory
Inexpensive, Free, and Teacher-Made Materials	1	2	3	4	5

16. Module 16. Circle the appropriate number.

	Very unsatisfactory				Very satisfactory
Curriculum Design	1	2	3	4	5

QUESTIONS 17-22. OVERALL EVALUATION.

17. In order to evaluate the whole course, circle the appropriate number.

Very unsatisfactory				Very satisfactory
1	2	3	4	5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Course Evaluation Questionnaire Results: Instructor and Participant Mean Ratings

QUESTION #	INSTRUCTORS WG n=9 M (SD)	PARTICIPANTS WG n=118 M (SD)	R1 n=53 M (SD)	R2 n=19 M (SD)	R3 n=10 M (SD)	R4 n=14 M (SD)	R5 n=22 M (SD)
1.	5.00 (0)	4.52 (.61)	4.48 (.61)	4.37 (.68)	4.60 (.52)	4.79 (.43)	4.55 (.67)
2.	5.00 (0)	4.41 (.72)	4.53 (.70)	3.84 (.90)	4.89 (.33)	4.27 (.61)	4.50 (.51)
3.	4.78 (.44)	4.55 (.61)	4.60 (.60)	4.32 (.67)	4.50 (.53)	4.79 (.43)	4.50 (.67)
4.	4.89 (.11)	4.39 (.73)	4.45 (.67)	4.11 (.74)	4.70 (.48)	4.29 (1.07)	4.41 (.67)
5.	4.50 (.53)	4.26 (.83)	4.46 (.75)	3.68 (.95)	4.30 (.48)	4.50 (.65)	4.14 (.94)
6.	4.50 (.53)	4.25 (.88)	4.36 (.79)	3.68 (1.00)	4.50 (1.27)	4.43 (.76)	4.27 (.70)
7.	5.00 (0)	4.44 (.65)	4.46 (.64)	4.11 (.81)	4.60 (.52)	4.64 (.50)	4.50 (.60)
8.	4.56 (.53)	4.48 (.66)	4.49 (.70)	4.33 (.59)	4.60 (.70)	4.64 (.63)	4.41 (.67)
9.	3.56 (.73)	3.87 (.94)	3.94 (1.05)	3.53 (.84)	4.11 (.60)	4.14 (.86)	3.73 (.88)
10.	3.89 (.60)	4.22 (.84)	4.30 (.87)	3.95 (.78)	4.50 (.53)	4.50 (.76)	3.96 (.90)
11.	4.56 (.53)	4.36 (.77)	4.26 (.76)	4.11 (.88)	4.60 (.97)	4.79 (.43)	4.41 (.67)
12.	4.78 (.67)	4.22 (.90)	4.26 (.92)	4.00 (.88)	4.10 (.99)	4.77 (.43)	4.00 (.93)
13.	5.00 (0)	4.45 (.70)	4.62 (.66)	4.16 (.69)	4.30 (.48)	4.00 (1.10)	4.46 (.67)
14.	4.89 (.33)	4.50 (.68)	4.55 (.67)	4.32 (.58)	4.50 (.53)	4.29 (1.07)	4.68 (.48)
15.	4.33 (.50)	4.47 (.85)	4.64 (.59)	4.50 (.70)	3.50 (1.43)	4.93 (.27)	4.18 (1.01)
16.	4.33 (.71)	4.06 (.79)	4.21 (.75)	3.84 (.60)	4.30 (.48)	4.00 (.91)	3.81 (.98)
17.	4.78 (.44)	4.42 (.71)	4.4 (.73)	4.32 (.67)	4.22 (.67)	4.39 (.96)	4.68 (.48)
18.	3.11 (.93)	3.35 (.84)	3.15 (.87)	3.42 (.90)	3.70 (.82)	3.86 (.36)	3.27 (.83)
19.	4.56 (.53)	4.31 (.82)	4.37 (.72)	4.11 (.81)	4.70 (.68)	4.43 (.76)	4.09 (1.07)
20.	4.22 (.44)	3.85 (.97)	3.96 (.93)	3.74 (.99)	3.60 (.97)	3.93 (.92)	3.73 (1.12)

Note: WG=whole group, R=region, M=mean, SD=standard deviation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

'Before Paragraph' Salient Categories : frequency counts (percentages)

Category #	Category Name	WG n=92 (100%)	R1 n=35 (100%)	R2 n=16 (100%)	R3 n=8 (100%)	R4 n=12 (100%)	R5 n=21 (100%)
10.	New concepts to enhance general knowledge and skills	29/92 (31.5%)	12/35 (34.3%)	8/16 (50%)	2/8 (25%)	3/12 (25%)	4/21 (19%)
4.	Oral and written English to improve accuracy in language use for increased professionalism	27/92 (29.3%)	8/35 (22.9%)	7/16 (43.8%)	4/8 (50%)	4/12 (33.3%)	4/21 (19%)
38.	New learning and teaching strategies	25/92 (27.2%)	14/35 (40%)	5/16 (31.3%)	3/8 (37.5%)	0/12 (0%)	3/21 (14.3%)
15.	ESL pedagogy through sharing information and experiences with professional colleagues	23/92 (25%)	4/35 (11.4%)	5/16 (31.3%)	1/8 (12.5%)	3/12 (25%)	10/21 (47.6%)
5.	New teaching techniques (technology) using audio-visual aids	22/92 (23.9%)	2/35 (5.7%)	3/16 (18.8%)	0/8 (0%)	6/12 (50%)	11/21 (52.4%)
32.	Improve and increase colloquial English fluency	20/92 (21.7%)	7/35 (20%)	4/16 (25%)	1/8 (12.5%)	2/12 (16.7%)	6/21 (28.6%)
18.	How to prepare and/or obtain teaching materials	15/92 (16.3%)	11/35 (31.4%)	3/16 (18.8%)	0/8 (0%)	0/12 (0%)	1/21 (4.8%)
28.	Activities for management of large groups (36-40 students)	15/92 (16.3%)	7/35 (20%)	3/16 (18.8%)	2/8 (25%)	1/12 (8.3%)	2/21 (9.5%)

Note: WG=whole group, R=region

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4

'After Paragraph' Salient Categories : frequency counts (percentages)

Category #	Category Name	WG n=92 (100%)	R1 n=35 (100%)	R2 n=16 (100%)	R3 n=8 (100%)	R4 n=12 (100%)	R5 n=21 (100%)
12.	Philosophy and implementation of communicative approach	58/92 (63%)	22/35 (62%)	8/16 (50%)	6/8 (75%)	8/12 (66.7%)	14/21 (66.7%)
23.	New ideas which was a renewal/refresher	34/92 (37%)	16/35 (45.7%)	4/16 (25%)	2/8 (25%)	4/12 (33.3%)	8/21 (38.1%)
16.	Vocabulary which enriched understanding and speaking of English for instructional purposes	26/92 (28.3%)	8/35 (22.9%)	4/16 (25%)	2/8 (25%)	1/12 (8.3%)	11/21 (52.4%)
14.	How to base teaching/learning on students' needs and interests (i.e., student-centered); led to entertaining way to teach with more freedom	20/92 (21.7%)	12/35 (34.3%)	2/16 (12.5%)	2/8 (25%)	3/12 (25%)	1/21 (4.8%)
30.	Information through collegial interaction and sharing	19/92 (20.7%)	5/35 (14.3%)	4/16 (25%)	1/8 (12.5%)	0/12 (0%)	9/21 (42.9%)
17.	Practical and fun activities (i.e., games and songs for reading comprehension)	16/92 (17.4%)	6/35 (17.1%)	2/16 (12.5%)	2/8 (25%)	1/12 (8.3%)	5/21 (23.8%)

Note: WG=whole group, R=region

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

THE COSTA RICA TEACHER TRAINING PROJECT:

WRITTEN PARAGRAPH BEFORE THE COURSE

Name: Training Centre:

As participants in this project, your opinions and ideas are very important to us. They will help with the program evaluation. This is **NOT** a test.

Please write one paragraph in English below (100 to 150 words) on the following topic:

WHAT I HOPE TO LEARN IN THIS COURSE.

Please write in complete sentences, **not** in note form.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH!

THE COSTA RICA TEACHER TRAINING PROJECT:

WRITTEN PARAGRAPH *AFTER* THE COURSE

Name: Training Centre:

As participants in this project, your opinions and ideas are very important to us. They will help with the program evaluation. This is **NOT** a test.

Please write one paragraph in English below (100 to 150 words) on the following topic:

WHAT I HAVE LEARNED IN THIS COURSE.

Please write in complete sentences, **not** in note form.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH!

APPENDIX D - 'BEFORE PARAGRAPH' CATEGORIES: What I hope to learn in this course

(All the categories below, with the exception of #53, express definitive and concrete learning expectations. Category #53 is the expression of a sentiment.)

Category # Category Name (frequency count of whole group)

1. Practical teaching aids (materials, tools) (5)
2. New 'fun' activities: doing, playing, having fun (13)
3. Practical applications of English for tourism (1)
4. Oral and written English to improve accuracy in language use for increased professionalism (27)
5. New teaching techniques (technology) using audio-visual aids (22)
6. Greater accuracy because of 'criole' influence (maybe unlearn certain things) (2)
7. Learn through observing demonstration lessons (2)
8. Evaluation instruments (tests) and strategies (14)
9. Individual evaluation and co-evaluation (2)
10. New concepts to enhance general knowledge and skills (29)
11. Objectives for each high school grade (firmer idea) (1)
12. Reading comprehension skills (2)
13. Listening skills (1)
14. ESL methodologies to compare with how Spanish as L2 is taught (1)
15. ESL pedagogy through sharing information and experiences with professional colleagues (23)
16. Up-to-date approach for professional improvement (refresher) (11)
17. How to teach four skills (reading, writing, listening, speaking) in integrated way (6)
18. How to prepare and/or obtain teaching materials (15)
19. Grammar (non-boring and creative) approach and evaluation techniques ("tablas de cotejo") (9)
20. How to correct pronunciation, vocabulary, writing, reading problems and grammar (7)
21. How to forget teaching for exams and prepare students for daily-life communicative situations (5)
22. General knowledge from increased collegial interaction and thereby gain emotional security (1)
23. Methods and exams for communicative approach (10)
24. Composition (writing) skills (3)
25. Information on reading and writing materials (1)
26. Information to clarify new programs for English L2 teaching (MEP) (5)
27. General knowledge for more order and authority in decisions (1)
28. Activities for management of large groups (36-40 students) (15)
29. Strategies to increase security in using communicative method (1)
30. How to have 'active' lessons (3)
31. Practical things ('don't want to learn concepts or theories) (2)
32. Improve and increase colloquial English fluency (20)

33. Factual knowledge in subject areas like ecology, folk recipes (special, difficult subject areas (4)
34. How to motivate students to talk English constantly (in class) (3)
35. How to get topical, simple reading material (1)
36. Group and individual work (participation) (2)
37. How to dispel confusion (demystify) about new methodologies and programs (1)
38. New learning and teaching strategies (25)
39. How to get students to think in English and get connotations of things (2)
40. Technical English (for teacher in technical school) (1)
41. How to use weapons (psychological?) of TV programmers to fight against bad TV (2)
42. How to make English L2 learning exciting so students are motivated (4)
43. Whens and whys of videos (as introduction to topic or entertainment at end of topic) (1)
44. Use of videos as partial replacement of traditional teacher instruction and shorten period of each lesson (1)
45. Titles of new textbooks and reference books for teachers (3)
46. How to teach English in English (1)
47. More information on pitfalls and problems for ESL learners (1)
48. Vocabulary for thematic approach (1)
49. How to obtain or create 'native' teaching materials (1)
50. How to benefit children and/or country (3)
51. How to teach younger children with songs and poems (1)
52. How to establish ongoing back-up (personnel) from English-speaking countries (1)
53. Statement of gratitude/happiness for invitation (opportunity) to participate (15)

APPENDIX E - 'AFTER PARAGRAPH' CATEGORIES: What I have learned in this course

(Categories 1 to 33 reflect definitive and concrete perceptions of learning achievements. Categories 34 to 68 are miscellaneous comments and sentiments about the course in general, including praise/criticism, likes dislikes, needs met and unmet etc.)

Category # Category Name (frequency count of whole group)

1. How to create new atmosphere (different view) in classroom (teacher as facilitator (8)
2. New and improved evaluation techniques (practical) (14)
3. How to teach English with increased confidence (certainty) (7)
4. Different cloze tests (1)
5. Different writing tests (1)
6. How to teach English in English (speaking) (8)
7. How to collect/use materials (newspapers, magazines, menus, brochures) (8)
8. Non-boring ways to teach English (3)
9. How to make students develop whole skills (2)
10. How to change learning of English in high schools (3)
11. How to put in practice the second language (2)
12. Philosophy and implementation of communicative approach (58)
13. How to update teaching lessons (2)
14. How to base teaching/learning on students' needs and interests (i.e. student-centered); led to entertaining way to teach with more freedom (20)
15. How to teach with new tools and materials (practical realia) (8)
16. Vocabulary which enriched understanding and speaking of English for instructional purpose (26)
17. Practical and fun activities (i.e., games and songs for reading comprehension (16)
18. How to make lessons more active (participatory on part of students) (1)
19. Activities both individual and group (1)
20. How to adapt activities and objectives to C.R. curriculum (2)
21. How to structure teaching more (4)
22. Knowledge about 4 skills (techniques and activities) (13)
23. New ideas which was a renewal/refresher (34)
24. How to prepare an interesting lesson plan (6)
25. Techniques to convey meanings (2)
26. Use of blackboard to practice skills (6)
27. Group interaction strategies (2)
28. How to adapt text and materials to students' needs (3)
29. How important teacher is in learning process (role of teacher and behavior) (4)
30. Information through collegial interaction and sharing (19)
31. Names of 7 steps in writing (accuracy and punctuation) (3)
32. Communicative method with greater clarity (3)
33. Correction of students should be done before/after an activity (1)

34. Needs/hopes for more English-training courses (10)
35. Enjoyed meeting quality teachers from Canada and C.R. (1)
36. Lack of time to implement some activities (impractical) (7)
37. Course should be obligatory for all C.R. English teachers (1)
38. Liked 'testing' patterns (2)
39. Course exceeded expectations (1)
40. More time needed to assimilate contents of course (1)
41. Exceeded expectations, very interesting, useful, practical (5)
42. Appreciated that course given locally (2)
43. Comprehensiveness (from high tech information, through sophisticated material, to inexpensive, teacher-made material) (7)
44. Subjective needs ("I don't have knowledge of grammar", and "Writing for me is difficult") (1)
45. Expression of thanks/congratulations/praise for course (38)
46. Good course for teaching ESL to novices (1)
47. Praise/thanks for trainer who gave the course (14)
48. Good review of theory in handbook and videos (2)
49. Didn't appreciate impracticality of written exams (pressure) (1)
50. Presentations could have been evaluated (1)
51. Some modules suited only for higher levels (university) (1)
52. Satisfying and motivating (1)
53. Praise for excellent materials (handbook excellent resource 'like a teacher's Bible' and videos) (13)
54. Combination of teaching cultures (C.R. and Canadian); people/ culture exchange (5)
55. Satisfaction (fulfilled expectations) (1)
56. Questions about speaking and grammar-teaching answered (1)
57. Found some videos unrealistic in elevated spoken English level of students "What methodology was used before the video?" (2)
58. Not enough accent on how to get over student rejection of being taught English in English (1)
59. Thought more videos should have been shot in C.R. classrooms (1)
60. Results will not be as good in C.R. schools as depicted in videos (1)
61. Module 6 inappropriate (1)
62. Module 11 inappropriate (1)
63. Need group work to develop answers to 'Questions' at end of each module (1)
64. Need more time and freedom; too constrained by Ministry and tests and requirements (2)
65. Course opened our minds (2)
66. Difficult to implement course because students are 'hungry' in towns, lacking values; not appropriate to life/learning situation of students (1)
67. Considers course a scientific approach (1)
68. Too much in second part of course for adequate learning (1)